



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

R. TRAVERS HERFORD'S "CHRISTIANITY IN TALMUD
AND MIDRASH."

Christianity in Talmud and Midrash. By R. TRAVERS HERFORD, B.A.
(London: Williams & Norgate, 1903. xvi and 449 pp. 8°.)

THIS work aims at presenting, with approximate completeness, what the Jewish traditional literature (Talmud and Midrash) has to say concerning the Founder and adherents of Christianity. The author's theme is thus a double one: *Jesus* in the old Jewish tradition, and the *Minim* in so far as adherents of Christianity are to be understood under that term. Both sides of the theme offer many difficulties to the investigator; and the texts, which must be cited, again and again require fresh critical examination, however often they have already been interpreted before. To adduce only the most fundamental of these problems, even the questions whether in the Jesus-texts Jesus is really meant, and whether in the Minim-texts Christians are intended, are still far from settled. Mr. Herford, who with rare devotion, with a wide outlook and sound scholarship, has devoted several years to a study of the question, proceeds by the inductive method. He first marshals (pp. 35-341) the "Passages from the Rabbinic Literature illustrating the Rise and Development of Christianity in the early Centuries," and in his second part (pp. 342-397) formulates the "General Results" which he has arrived at from the consideration of the passages previously collected and discussed. The first part—much the larger of the two—falls into two sections: (A) passages relating to Jesus (Nos. 1-25), and (B) passages referring to Minim and Minuth (Nos. 26-139). The author deserves special thanks for providing in an Appendix (pp. 401-36) the originals of all the 139 shorter or longer texts cited, so that the reader can conveniently survey the materials on which the whole treatise is based, and can also easily test for himself the renderings and explanations which Mr. Herford has given of this long array of passages derived from many scattered sources.

The author has, however, spared himself no pains, though he has

lessened the reader's trouble. He appends to the translation of every text a searching commentary, which includes secondary as well as primary issues. Thus each of the 139 numbers forms, in a sense, an independent study. On the one hand, this method leads to many repetitions, and also entails the separation from one another of matters which belong together. On the other hand, the thoroughness and circumspection of the author's procedure in detail in his first part materially contribute to the consequence that the "General Results" in his second part inspire confidence and bear the stamp of well-founded theses. The mistakes into which the author occasionally falls in translating his texts are sometimes serious enough; but in view of the great conscientiousness which distinguishes Mr. Herford's work they detract little from its general worth, especially as they concern points of slight or no importance in relation to the essential subject matter of the discussion. I will at this point draw attention to some of these errors of translation. In the first number (p. 35) the discussion concerning Ben Stada (*Sabbath*, 104 b) is incorrectly reproduced, for the questions and answers of the original are not noted as such in the rendering. The first words of this discussion בן סטדא בן פנדירא should not be rendered "Ben Stada is Ben Pandira," but "Ben Stada? Was he not son of Pandira?" &c. P. 41: In the passage (*Chagiga*, 4 b) אין כי הא דרב ביבי Mr. Herford renders אין כי הא "None but this," after Biblical usage. But the meaning is "Yes! Like this."—P. 46: "founding his house," "founding his sepulchre," are Mr. Herford's renderings of לסוד and לסוד את ביתו (Yoma, 66 b). He was thinking of יסד, but לסוד belongs to the verb which also occurs in Deuteronomy xxvii. 4 (ושרת), and means "to plaster."—On the same page, "because they differed on them" is the translation of מפני שהפליגם בדברים, but the meaning is, "because he diverted them from the subject"; instead of answering their questions he spoke to them on other matters.—P. 83: "Ulla says, 'Would it be supposed that a revolutionary had aught in his favour?'" This is the rendering of the words (*Sanhedrin*, 43 a) ותסברא בר הפוכי זכות הוא. The meaning is: "Dost thou think that he (Jesus) is one for whom something is to be sought that speaks in his favour?" (Compare מהפיכנא בזכותיה, *Sabbath*, 119 a.) The author seems, however, to have taken בר הפוכי in the sense of "son of overthrowing," whence "destroyer," "revolutionary"; and the word זכות if separated, as Mr. Herford separates it, from הפוכי is left syntactically in the air. Later on (p. 355) Mr. Herford again refers to the "statement of Ulla that Jesus was a revolutionary," and even categorically asserts (p. 349), as an ingredient of the Rabbinic

account of Jesus, that "he was a revolutionary." All this arises from the mistranslation indicated. On p. 88 seq. the same passage (from *Sanhedrin*, 43 a) is translated again somewhat differently, but Jesus still bears the epithet "a revolutionary," for which there is no foundation.—P. 104: "It is different in regard to Minuth, which bites a man, so that he comes to be bitten afterwards" (*Aboda Zara*, 27 b). Misled by the previous citation from *Kohleth*, X, 8 (ישבנו), Mr. Herford has not understood the words דמשכא and למימשך in their right sense (from משך "to draw"), and derives them quite ungrammatically from נשך "to bite."—P. 115: In the passage from *Jer. Sanhedrin*, 25 d, the translator, as a consequence of reading צפור instead of צרור ("clod"), renders the word by "bird," and thus the story becomes a magic transformation of a bird into a calf.—P. 136: In the passage from the *Tosefta*, *Berachoth*, III, 25, the words פרושים and גרים are wrongly rendered "seceders" and "strangers." The right meaning is the "pious" and the "proselytes."—P. 139: In the passage from the *Baraitha* (*Aboda Zara*, 17 a), מהו לעשות הימנו בית הכסא לכהן גדול, the translator separates the first two words from the rest ("what may be done with it?"), and the rest of the passage then has to constitute an independent sentence. Clearly בית הכסא is the object to the verb לעשות.—P. 157: In the translation of *Gittin*, 45 b, and p. 177, in the translation of *Tos. Chullin*, II, 21, in place of "receive" must be substituted "buy" (לוקחין).—P. 161: Mr. Herford informs us that for some time he was under the impression that in *Tos. Yadaim*, II, 16, the expression הלכות מינין referred to "ordinances concerning heretics." The exact words used are: אמרתי לו: את ההלכות ואת התשובות במינין. But a comparison with *Jer. Bik-kurim*, 65 d, brought him to the conclusion that the reference was here also to the seven "kinds" of fruits indigenous to Palestine. Further consideration would, however, have convinced him that we must read in the *Tosefta*, not בפייגין, but בפנין, in the sense of למיניכיהם, which occurs three lines later ("your votes," i.e. "your decisions").—P. 173 (*Aboda Zara*, 26 a, b): The words סמי מוכא belong to the remark of Jochanan (סמי is imperative); Jochanan thereby indicates that Abahu may omit (strike out) the reference to apostates in the *Baraitha* cited. What follows in the text is also wrongly reproduced in the translation, for Mr. Herford has missed the meaning of the word ולישני.—P. 183: When in *Aboda Zara*, 17 a, the words הב הב (Prov. xxx. 15) are interpreted as הבא הבא, the translation is not "Give, give."—P. 184: In the same passage from the Talmud, the words ומעברה לא, occurring

before the incident of Eleazar b. Dordaya, are not recognized by the translator as a question, but are connected by him with the preceding ("and not from her sin"), and thus the whole context is destroyed.—P. 231: In the account of the conversation between Rabban Gamliel and the Minim (*Sanhedrin*, 90 b), the translator thrice misses the significance of the word וְיִלְמָא ("or perhaps?") with which the Minim refute the biblical texts adduced to prove the resurrection of the dead. It hence results that the whole conversation is incorrectly, or, one might rather say, unintelligibly reproduced.—P. 267: "As a Talmudist," "as a Scripture-teacher," are altogether inadequate translations of the words בְּתַנְאִי and בְּקִרְאִי. The latter means at all events "in Bible texts," i.e. in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures; the first word is not quite clear; but the word anyhow means the knowledge of the tradition. Abahu says he had praised Safra as a "great man" in the knowledge of tradition, but not also as such in the knowledge of the Bible. Moreover, the author has given a twist to the sense of the whole passage by assuming that Abahu had recommended Safra to the Minim of Caesarea as a teacher. There is nothing of the kind implied in the passage. What he adduces on p. 269 against my interpretation of the passage I cannot accept. (Mr. Herford cites me as holding that Safra was engaged by the Minim "as an assistant in collecting the Imperial revenue." I have never asserted this. What I really said (*Agada der Pal. Amoräer*, II, 96) is: "Einmal empfahl er ihnen Safra zur Berücksichtigung in Zollsachen. Safra bekam dadurch Zollerlass für mehrere Jahre.")—P. 281: "Thy scalp" is an unfounded rendering of עֲקָמוֹתָךְ (*Sanhedrin*, 91 a). The reference is to the "crookedness" of the humpbacked Gebiha ben Pesisa, whose deformity the Min threatens to straighten out. For this rudeness Gebiha expresses his gratitude with Socratic irony by rejoining: "If thou dost so, I shall call thee a skilful physician, and thou wilt receive a great reward." The author has made it impossible for him to understand the retort of Gebiha, and is driven to his forced explanation, which he gives at the end of the paragraph (p. 282).

Such errors in translation as have been adduced above show how difficult it is to avoid mistakes in understanding Talmudical texts, unless the student has become habituated to these texts by long years of practice. But these errors, as I have already said, do not affect one's appreciation of the value of Mr. Herford's performance as a whole. Every one must recognize that the author has erected, for both parts of his theme, a storehouse in which are contained all the relevant original texts, judged with scientific width of view and with noteworthy impartiality.

As regards the first part of his theme, the author practically offers nothing beyond what is contained in H. Laible's monograph, *Jesus Christus im Talmud* (Berlin, 1891). But our author's comments on the texts are far more instructive and thoroughgoing than are his predecessor's, and Mr. Herford is besides less prone to hypothesis than is Laible. From Mr. Herford's work we perceive anew how scanty the whole of this material is, and how little Tannaim and Amoraim had to say about Jesus. Yet, scanty as the material produced is, it would be scantier still were it not that several passages are included which on nearer examination have nothing to do with Jesus. Take, for instance, the statement (p. 43) which Simon b. Azzai adduces, from a Book of Genealogies found by him in Jerusalem (*Mishnah Yebamoth*, IV, 13; *T. B. Yebamoth*, 49 b), איש פלוני כמזר מאשת איש. With the exception of the expression פלוני ("N.N."), there is nothing to show that Jesus is referred to in this report cited in confirmation of a halachic opinion of Joshua b. Chananya. Besides, we must not assume that איש פלוני is quite identical with the elsewhere-used פלוני; and the theory is moreover by no means incontestable which interprets פלוני as Jesus in the question addressed to Eliezer b. Hyrkanos (p. 45; *Yoma*, 66 b). In the report of Ben Azzai it is highly probable that reference is made to a member of some distinguished Jerusalem family, whose illegitimate birth is recorded, so as to exhort, by this warning, the rest to preserve their family record from stain. Inasmuch as the object, so far as the halacha is concerned, is to establish the fact that the term כמזר designates one who is the offspring of a union forbidden under pain of death, the name of the individual in question remains unmentioned. We have here, then, an example in which the name is indifferent, and with this may be compared the formula of the Mishnah (*Sanhedrin*, III, 7 [11]: *T. B. Sanh.* 29 a) regarding the pronouncement of their verdict by the judges: איש פלוני אתה זכאי איש פלוני אתה חייב.—Mr. Herford himself devotes a paragraph to demonstrate that a passage generally included among the references to Jesus must be removed from that category. We refer to the passage regarding the execution of Ben Stada at Lydda, an incident related in Tannaite sources (*Tos. Sanhedrin*, X, 11; *Jer. Sanh.* 25 c, d; *Bab. Sanh.* 67 a). This is the same Ben Stada who, in another Tannaite report bearing the name of Eliezer b. Hyrcanus (*Tos. Sabbath*, XI, 15; *Jer. Sabb.* 13 d; *Bab. Sabb.* 104 b), is said to have brought from Egypt magic formulae which he had cut into his body. Mr. Herford suggests (p. 345) that Ben Stada, who was executed as a leader of sedition, is identical with the false prophet who came from Egypt (Josephus, *Antiq.* XX, 8. 6; *Wars*, II, 13. 5: Acts xxi. 38). Whatever be the truth as to this identification, Mr. Herford is certainly right in

refusing to interpret the Tannaite passages quoted above as referring to Jesus under the name Ben Stada, for the former was not put to death in Lydda, but in Jerusalem. The identification of Jesus—or Ben Pantera (Pandira), as he is also called in the Palestinian sources (*Tos. Chullin*, II, 22, 23; *Jer. Sabb.* 14 d; *Aboda Zara*, 49 d)—with Ben Stada first took place in the Babylonian schools. With reference to the two above-cited Tannaite traditions, the question is propounded in the Babylonian Talmud (*Sabbath*, 104 b; *Sanhedrin*, 67 a): בן סטדא בן פנדירא הוא, “He is here called Ben Stada, while above he was named Ben Pandira.” The discussion which follows, and which opens with a reconciling remark of Rab Chisda’s, shows that the identity of the two names was taken for granted in Babylonia, but it does not prove that in the Tannaite sources בן סטדא was identified with Jesus. The post-Tannaite Palestinian sources are also ignorant of this identification of Ben Stada with Ben Pandira. In Babylonia the prevalence of this identification caused the addition of the words פסח בערב ותלאוהו to the *Baraita* narrating the execution of Ben Stada (*Sanhedrin*, 43 a). This item is wanting in the *Tosefta* and in the Jerusalem Talmud; it is taken over from the Tannaite tradition concerning the execution of Jesus (*Sanh.*, 93 a): בערב פסח תלאוהו [לישו הנצרי]. Mr. Herford is therefore quite correct in his hypothesis concerning Ben Stada; it is only a pity that he has not recognized that the identity of Ben Stada with Jesus is of late origin in the Babylonian Amoraite period.

The proverb quoted (on Joshua xiii. 22) by a Babylonian Amora of the second half of the fourth century (*Sanh.* 106 a) is incorrectly applied by Mr. Herford to the mother of Jesus (p. 45). It is a popular saying, which did not arise in Palestine, and in which no allusion to the Carpenter of Nazareth can possibly be contained.

Mr. Herford is rightly sceptical regarding the narrative in *Tractate Kallah* (p. 49), in which the names of the Tannaites, Eliezer, Joshua, and Akiba, are employed in an apocryphal manner. Laible (p. 37) does this passage the honour of seeking a historical kernel in it.—On the other hand, Mr. Herford is decidedly wrong when (p. 87) he detects a reference to the crucifixion of Jesus in the parable of Rabbi Meir on Deut. xxi. 23 (*Tos. Sanh.* IX, 7). With this parable it was designed to show how “accursed of God is he that is hanged,” and this on the ground of the idea that man is made in the image of God. In the parable God is not meant by the one brother who is described as מולך על כל העולם כולו (i. e. as ruler of the world, *κοσμοκράτωρ*, such as the Roman emperors were; cf. Ziegler, *Die Königsgleichnisse des Midrasch*, p. 10, n. 5); nor is the other brother, who was crucified as a robber, meant for Jesus (cp. *Agada der Tanaiten*, II, 59, 64).

That in the Talmud Balaam must sometimes be understood as typical of Jesus is a hypothesis which is almost universally accepted. But Mr. Harford goes too far when he assumes that there is also some reference to Jesus even in the sayings concerning the biblical sections dealing with Balaam (*Baba Bathra*, 14 b; *Jer. Pesachim*, 3 c). Although here and there people thought of Jesus when they spoke of Balaam, nevertheless the remarkable figure of the heathen prophet himself did not disappear from the ken of Tannaim and Amoraim. On the contrary, it was precisely the circumstance that the history of Balaam and his prophecies plays so conspicuous a part in the Pentateuch, although the incidents occurred outside the Israelite camp, that impelled the authorities of the Tannaite period to assert categorically that this section of the Pentateuch (Num. xxii-xxiv) was also written by Moses. And it is probable that the Amora of the third century, in whose name Samuel ben Nachman recorded the tradition that the Balaam-section should be recited every day, was moved to this by the desire to give prominent expression to the belief in the Mosaic authorship of the section, as indeed is done in *Baba Bathra*, 14 b. To the extraordinary position which the heathen prophet assumes in the Pentateuch must also be ascribed his mention in the *Mishnah Sanh.* X, 2, at the head of the four non-royal biblical persons who are excluded from participation in the future world. Mr. Herford indeed limits the identification of Balaam with Jesus with excellent arguments (p. 69); but he cannot refrain from suggesting that in the three other biblical characters named in chronological order in the same *Mishnah*, viz. Doeg, Ahitophel, and Gehazi, there is an allusion to the Apostle Peter, Judas Iscariot, and Paul (p. 71). Mr. Herford returns (p. 99 seq.) to the identification of the Gehazi of the Agada (*Sota*, 47 a; *Sanh.* 107 b) with the Apostle Paul; and the suggestion gains speciousness when the circumstance that Elisha betook himself to Damascus in order—as Rabbi Jochanan says—to lead Gehazi back to the right way, is brought into relation with the fact that Paul received Christianity in Damascus. But it is impossible to adduce a real proof for the identification of Gehazi and Paul in the Agadic texts. (In this same passage the words אבן שאבת תלה לו לחטאת ירבעם are translated by Mr. Herford (p. 101): “He set up a lodestone according to the sin of Jeroboam.” He fails to understand that חטאת ירבעם is Jeroboam’s golden calf, which Gehazi suspended in the air by means of a lodestone, thus convincing the deluded people that the calf possessed divine powers. Further on, again, Mr. Herford does not perceive that the words שם חקק לה אפומה also refer to the calf (“the sin of Jeroboam”). These misconceptions lead Mr. Herford to a distorted explanation of the whole passage, including the assumption of an image of Jesus known to the Rabbis.)

The passage just discussed finds us in the second part of Mr. Herford's book, for in the Agada about Gehazi we reach the first of the author's texts concerning Minim and Minuth. He divides these texts into four groups: (1) "Descriptions and Definitions of Minim and Minuth"; (2) "Polemical Encounters between Jews and Minim"; (3) "Polemical Allusions to Minim, Minuth"; and (4) "Miscellaneous Passages referring to Minim." The whole of the relevant material is marshalled in systematic order, and grateful recognition is due to Mr. Herford for this collection of passages and for his comments on them. The author's general conclusions as to the Minim-passages in Talmud and Midrash are given in three paragraphs of the second chapter of Part II. In § 1 (pp. 362-5) Mr. Herford discusses the name "Min." He propounds a very artificial explanation of the word. He supposes that as the Hebrew word מִין has an Aramaic equivalent מן ("kind, species"), the similarity of sound between the Aramaic מן and the Hebrew מִין (which besides other senses means "infidelity," "unbelief") led to the use of the Hebrew מִין in the sense "infidelity," "unbelief." Mr. Herford was led to this suggestion by a hypothesis of Friedmann, who in his commentary on *Pesikta Rabbathi* (101 a) explains the expression בְּרֵא דְּמִינִיתָ as equivalent to בֵּן הַמִּינִית, since the Hebrew מִין is rendered by the Aramaic מן. But it is altogether incredible that the word "Min" acquired its Rabbinic significance in any such way. I am sorry that the author has not acquainted himself with what I have written on the origin of the word "Min" in the *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXVIII, 45. Though, however, he has not read my article ("Le mot 'Minim' dans le Talmud"), he arrives at the same conclusions as myself in his polemic against Friedländer in § 2, "Who were the Minim" (pp. 365-81). He rightly emphasises that those Tannaim to whom occupation with Gnostic thought was ascribed, are never called "Minim," and that when Friedländer says that "Acher der Min κατ' ἐξοχήν war," this denotation of Acher does not emanate from the Talmud. Mr. Herford further shows that Friedländer suppresses passages in which by "Minim" are unquestionably meant Christians, and that in other respects Friedländer deals with the Minim-passages in a very arbitrary fashion. Mr. Herford finally arrives at the conclusions that in general when the Talmud or Midrash mentions the "Minim" the reference is to Jewish Christians, but that occasionally other heretics or enemies of Judaism were called "Minim," and that opinions were sometimes attributed to the "Minim" which have nothing to do with Christianity.—§ 3 ("The Place of the Minim in History," pp. 381-97) connects the evidence concerning the "Minim" with the trend of

the history of the first post-Christian century. Especially noteworthy is the happy use by Mr. Herford of a suggestion of Graetz, which has enabled our author to extract from the Epistle to the Hebrews several quotations which admirably illustrate the opinions ascribed to the "Minim" (see pp. 264, 272, 322, 339). Mr. Herford had already (in § 2, p. 378) quoted the following passage from Jerome (*Ep. 89 ad Augustinum*) concerning a "heresy of the Jews": "quae dicitur Minæorum, et a Pharissæis nunc usque damnatur, quos vulgo Nazaræos nuncupant . . .; sed, dum volunt et Judæi esse et Christiani, nec Judæi sunt nec Christiani." The light which this passage throws on the Minim of the Jewish traditional literature is not always appreciated at its true value.

Of the special points raised by Mr. Herford in his comments on the Minim-passages, we may first note his theory regarding the puzzling term **בִּי אֲבִידִין**, which he explains from the Greek *φῶδεῖον* as "places for philosophical disputations" (p. 167). This hypothesis is not altogether satisfactory. We must not leave out of account that in the chief passage concerning **בִּי אֲבִידִין** and **בִּי נֶצְרָפִי** (*Sabbath*, 116a) the reference is to such places of meeting as were still extant in Babylonia in the fourth century. Joseph b. Chama (for this is the correct reading for the Joseph b. Chanin of the editions), who addressed to Abahu the question regarding the books of Bē-Abidan, was also a Babylonian scholar, the father of Raba. A son of Joseph, head of the School of Pumbeditha, had intercourse with the people of Bē-Abidan, while Joseph's pupil Raba (**רַבָּא** must be read for **רַב**) held himself aloof from them. Again, in *Erubin*, 79b, 80a (p. 165), we find Bē-Abidan used in a Babylonian context. (In that passage the reference is not to wine for the "Lord's Supper," as Herford (p. 170) thinks, but to the date-palms from which was prepared an intoxicating drink, **שִׁכְרָא**, which the associates of the **בִּי נֶצְרָפִי** drank on their feast-days.) The heroes of the stories in *T. Bab. Sabbath*, 152a, and *T. Bab. Aboda Zara*, 17b, are, it must be admitted, Palestinian Tannaim; but the name **בִּי אֲבִידִין** may merely have been a term transferred to Palestinian conditions, as is often the case in the Babylonian Talmud. Characteristic of this—as may be incidentally remarked—is the story concerning Joshua b. Perachya and Jesus (*Sanh.* 107b, p. 51). This story is indeed connected with a Baraitha, but is reported quite in the style of the Babylonian narrative, and even presents details which can only be interpreted from Babylonian conditions (**זָקַף לְבִנְתָּא**; **אִפִּיק אַרְבַּע מֵאוֹת שִׁפּוּרִי** (**וְשִׁמְתִּיה**). Hence the expressions **בִּי אֲבִידִין** and **בִּי נֶצְרָפִי** must remain a riddle which Mr. Herford's hypothesis fails to solve.

In noticing a work so rich in material as Mr. Herford's there is

naturally much opportunity for remarks or corrections. A few such points follow.

P. 51. The allegation at the close of the narrative concerning Joshua b. Perachya and Jesus (*Sanh.* 107 b: **ואמר מר ישו הנוצרי** (כישף והדיח את ישראל) deserved special treatment. It is a Baraitha which contains *in nuce* the attitude of the Tannaite epoch towards Jesus: "He performed magic and misled Israel." This Baraitha should also have been specially noticed on p. 351.

P. 86. The description **העובר כוכבים ומזלות** is a later change in the printed text of the Talmud. The original expression always runs **העובר עבודה זרה**. This is also the reading in *Mishnah Sanh.* VI, 4.

P. 89. With the statement (*Sanh.* 43 a) that Jesus "was near the government" (**קרוב למלכות הוה**), we might compare Luke xxiii. 7, where it is related that Herod (Antipas) interested himself in behalf of Jesus.

P. 90. The name of the second of the five disciples of Jesus (*Sanh.* 43 a) must be read Nakkai (Naqqai), not Neqai (Laible, p. 71, reads Neqaj). The word-play with **נָקִי** is then clearer. The same name was borne by the oldest-named Massorite, in the time of the war with Hadrian (see Berliner's *Magazin*, XVII, 169 seq.). Mr. Herford rightly derives the name from Nicodemus (John iii. 1), Hebrew **נקרימון**. The name is formed similarly to **שְׂמַאי**, **עוֹנִי**.—The narrative of the execution of the five disciples of Jesus, being introduced by the formula **תנו רבנן**, is thus marked out as a separate Baraitha, and is not, as Mr. Herford thinks (p. 91), a continuation of the previous Baraitha (**תניא**) on the execution of Jesus, accompanied, as that Baraitha is, with Amoraite remarks.

P. 94. I would remark that the group of five disciples of Jesus is most probably intended as a set-off to the five pupils of Jochanan ben Zaccai (*Mishnah Aboth*, II: **חמשה תלמידים היו לו לרבן יוחנן בן זכאי**; *Sanh.* 43 a: **חמשה תלמידים היו לו לישו**). There would also seem a reference to the five pupils of Akiba who were ordained by Jehuda b. Baba (*Aboda Zara*, 8 b). The choice of the names themselves is founded upon a vague knowledge of the names of the first followers of Jesus, and was determined by the word-plays of which the chosen names were susceptible.

P. 109. The author has not correctly understood the citation of *Koheleth*, X, 5, in the story of Joshua b. Levi's grandson (*Jer. Sabbath*, 14 d). It has the same significance as in the stories of the Babylonian Talmud, in which unconsidered expressions of disaster used by an important man produce the disaster spoken of (*Moed Katon*, 18 a; *Kethuboth*, 23 a, 62 b; *Baba Mezia*, 68 a).

P. 112. For R. Lazar read R. Eliezer. The allusion is not to

R. Eleazar b. Azarya (p. 113), but R. Eliezer b. Hyrkanos, as is always the case when ר' יהושע precedes ר' אליעזר.

P. 118. In the translation of *Tos. Sanh.* XIII, 4, בּוֹנֵן is wrongly joined to the subsequent word יֵרֵד ("descend into Gehinnom in their body"); the word must really be joined with the previous פּוֹשֵׁעַ.

Ibid. Mr. Herford translates ושִׁכְּפּוּ בַּתּוֹרָה "and those *who have lied* concerning the Torah." He elsewhere mistranslates כִּפּוּר ב in this way (pp. 123, 156, 289, 372). He gives the right meaning, however, on p. 299, where he renders שִׁכְּפּוּ בַּחֲדָיו שֶׁל עוֹלָם "they had *denied* the only one."

P. 127. (With reference to the בִּרְכַּת הַמִּיִּנִים.) "The word translated benediction serves equally for malediction, and it is rather in that sense that it is used in regard to the Minim." But as the word בִּרְכָה here means not blessing, but "formula of benediction," there is no thought of a euphemistic use of the word for קִלְלָה. The בִּרְכַּת הַמִּיִּנִים stands in the same category as the eighteen בִּרְכוֹת of the Prayer.

P. 136, note. R. Jose, in the passage cited from *Jer. Berachoth*, 8 a, is not Jose b. Chalafta, the Tannaite of the second century, but the Palestinian Amora who lived 200 years later. On his son Eleazar (here cited), see *Die Agada der paläst. Amoräer*, III, 236.

P. 155. On הגִּלְיוֹנִים וּסְפָרֵי מִיָּנִין see *Revue des Études Juives*, XXXVIII, 38 seq.

P. 171. יוֹם נּוֹצְרִי (*Aboda Zara*, 6 a, 7 b), "the Nazarene day"; more correctly, "the day of the Nazarene." Sunday is the day of the Nazarene, i.e. Jesus (יֵשׁוּ נּוֹצְרִי), as the day on which he rose. Compare *dies dominica*.

P. 185 n. The quotation from Aboth di R. Nathan is to be found on p. 7 a (not 7 b), ed. Schechter.

P. 188. The sign of interrogation after the words "she no longer lived in the world" may be removed when it is remembered that the expression אֵינָה חַיָּה לְעוֹלָם is identical with אֵינָה חַיָּה לְעוֹלָם הַבָּא.

P. 193, line 1. For "Exodus" read "Numbers."

P. 204, n. אִשְׁכַּח תִּנִּי is a very common formula in the Jerusalem Talmud, by which a Baraitha is introduced to complete, correct, or confirm an otherwise known Halacha. The formula must be translated, "He found (or: it was found) that the tradition was reported." The word וּפְלִיג which here follows means that the Baraitha so found contradicts the Halachic passage previously quoted. The question of Mr. Herford, "It is not clear to me," &c. (p. 205), is thus answered. The passage beginning אִשְׁכַּח no longer belongs to the answer of R. Simon.

P. 210. For אִשְׁכַּח בִּשְׁם ר' הוּנָא in *Jer. Naderim*, 38 a, must be read אִשְׁכַּח בִּשְׁם ר' הוּנָא. See *Die Agada der pal. Amoräer*, III, 123.

P. 220 seq. Very remarkable is the parallel which Mr. Herford draws between the two passages of *Koheleth Rabba* (on i. 8 and vii. 26). The emendation of *האשה* for *אלישע* is plausible. But if so, the emendation of Friedländer (*עקב איש כפר סכניא*) for *עקב איש כפר* (*נבוריא*) must also be accepted. Only thus is the parallel made complete. I myself had suggested (op. cit., III, 711) that in *Koheleth Rabba* to vii. 26 *ר' אלעזר* must be expanded to *ר' יצחק בן אלעזר*.

P. 247. "This refers to us" is an incorrect translation of *ואילו אנן* (*Pesachim*, 87 b). It should be rendered, "On the other hand, what concerns us," and construed with what follows.

P. 254. The missing reference (*Agada der Tannaite*, II, 50, n. 5), in which R. Meir's saying may be found, is Sifrê to Deut. xxxiii. 12.

P. 293. For R. Eliezer read Eleazar, i. e. ben Arach, whose saying (*Aboth*, II, 19) is cited, as the author rightly notes, on p. 295, below.

P. 298. *לחלוק* signifies, not "distinguish," but "contradict" ("dispute"). With this correction, Mr. Herford's explanation on p. 299 falls.

P. 303. Reuben, the authority for the Agada to Daniel iii. 25 (*Jer. Sabbath*, 8d) is not the Tannaite Reuben (b. Aristobulus), as Mr. Herford assumes, but is the Palestinian Amora of that name (see, concerning this Amora, *Agada der pal. Amoräer*, III, 79-86).

P. 324. For "Nissa" read "Naso."

P. 391. The statements concerning the proposed decanonization of the Book *Koheleth* can by no means be connected with those concerning the *Books of the Minim*. The Amoraim who use the term *מינות* in connexion with *Koheleth* employ it in the general sense of unbelief, heresy, without reference to Christianity¹.

Special praise is due to the exhaustive introduction (pp. 1-33) prefixed by the author to his work. He devotes it to the literature from which are derived the texts considered in the body of the work, and treats of the Jewish tradition as well as of its literature. The reader obtains an insight into the method of Jewish traditional exegesis, and into the contents of both branches of this literature: Halacha and Haggada (Agada). He also receives guidance as to the degree of trustworthiness attaching to the historical statements of the Talmud and Midrash. Historians are, as Mr. Herford indicates (p. 25 seq.), still far from agreeing upon a canon of criticism by which to judge the historical value of Rabbinical data. Mr. Herford himself offers (p. 29) this contribution to the question: "Perhaps we may make some approach to a general canon of criticism on the subject, if we say that in the literature referred to, the *obiter*

¹ The texts reproduced in the Appendix contain all sorts of misprints, which, however, can be corrected without difficulty.

dicta are of most value as evidence of historical fact; or, in other words, there is more reason to suspect exaggeration or invention in statements which appear to form part of the main line of argument, than in those which appear to be mere illustrative notes, added to the text and embedded in it."—In his preface (p. x) Mr. Herford thus expresses himself: "As a Christian who has for several years found his chief and absorbing intellectual interest in the study of the Rabbinical literature . . . I offer this book as a contribution to Christian scholarship." It says much, therefore, for Mr. Herford's impartiality that he later on (p. 31) remarks with reference to the Jewish and Christian investigators of the historical material presented by the Talmudical literature: "So far as I am competent to judge, it appears to me that Jewish historians—as is only natural—make a far more legitimate and intelligent use of the Rabbinical literature for historical purposes than is generally to be observed in the writings of Christian historians who have dealt with that literature." The same absence of bias is displayed by Mr. Herford in his judgment on Rabbinic Judaism (pp. 7 seq.): "What is usually called 'empty formalism,' 'solemn trifling,' and the like, deserves a nobler name; for it is—whether mistaken or not—an honest effort to apply the principle of the service of God to the smallest details and acts of life. . . . The great Rabbis whose work is preserved in the Talmud were not hypocrites or mere formalists, but men who fully realized the religious meaning of what was expressed in the form of legal precept and apparently trivial regulation. . . . Paul doubtless spoke out of the depths of his own experience; but he does not represent the mind of the great leaders of Rabbinism. And the system of thought and practice which bears that name is unfairly judged if it be condemned on the witness of its most determined enemies." Such words are rarely spoken by Christians concerning Rabbinism. These remarks are all the more gratifying, seeing that they occur in the introduction to a work devoted to an inquiry into the far from sympathetic utterances of the Talmudic writers on the subject of the Founder and the adherents of Christianity. Mr. Herford has regarded these utterances with the eye of an historian, and they thus could not injuriously affect his verdict on the spirit of the whole literature in which these utterances are to be found. The affectionate zeal with which he has betaken himself to the study of that literature has not failed of its reward. Despite faults in detail, his treatise will remain a standard work on the subject of Christianity in the Talmud and Midrash.

W. BACHER.